

**REMARKS:**

Claims 1, 3, and 11-23 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, and 11-23 were cancelled, and claims 24-64 were added. Therefore, claims 24-64 are now pending in this application.

**Claim Objections**

The Examiner objected to several claims because of various alleged formalities. Because Applicant has cancelled all of the previously pending claims, these objections are believed moot.

**102 Rejections**

Claims 3, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,813,009 to Johnson. Applicant has cancelled these claims. As such, these rejections are believed moot.

Newly added claim 24 recites:

A method, comprising:  
receiving a succession of electronic documents into a document management system, wherein each of the succession of electronic documents is received at a corresponding point in time; and  
for each of the received electronic documents:  
    generating a unique time-based address corresponding to the point in time at which the electronic document was received; and  
    storing the electronic document in a time-addressable storage system at a corresponding storage location having an address corresponding to the unique time-based address for the electronic document.

Applicant submits that Johnson does not teach or suggest, among other things, claim 24's "unique time-based address." Specifically, Johnson does not teach or suggest "generating a unique time-based address corresponding to the point in time at which the electronic document was received" for "each of the received electronic documents" or "storing the electronic document in a time-addressable storage system at a corresponding storage location having an address corresponding to the unique time-based address for the electronic document," as recited in claim 24.

Johnson refers to “creation source and date” merely as a part of a “unique identifying tag” “for each record processed by the system”:

Preferred features of a ILM-compliant system include: (1) open (non-proprietary) architectural hardware, software, network and communications components which comply with industry standards for communications protocols and data formatting; (2) a mechanism to maintain control over system resources (e.g. system catalogues) on multiple platforms and in multiple geographic locations; (3) normalization and tracking of stored documents, formatted data and messaging across databases (this requires the creation and/or recognition of a unique identifying tag, e.g., containing document/file name, creation source and date, file location, priority and certification data, for each record processed by the system); (4) the ability to recognize the destination and source of information, to route in-coming information and to respond in real-time to electronic information entering the enterprise from external entities; (5) adherence to scheduled retention parameters for all stored information across platform databases; (6) security against unauthorized access to and/or modification of stored information, including such security vehicles as encryption of access and stored information; (7) recognition of and control over electronically maintained versions and iterations of files and documents within the enterprise infrastructure; and (8) creation and maintenance of a centralized audit point for all information created, stored and/or sent outside of the enterprise.

See Johnson 7:31-56 (emphasis added). Johnson’s “unique identifying tag” (which may include “creation source and date”) is used to “track tagged information through its many stages within the organization, from receipt and initial parsing through processing, backup and eventual disposal.” See Johnson at 12:40-44. However, nowhere in Johnson is the “unique identifying tag” used as an “address,” much less the “unique time-based address” of claim 24. Furthermore, Johnson does not teach or suggest the “time-addressable storage system” of claim 24.

Accordingly, claim 24 and its respective dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct over Johnson. Claims 39, 41, 48, and 56, and their respective dependent claims, are believed to be patentably distinct over Johnson for at least reasons similar to those stated for claim 24.

Applicant also asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct over Johnson, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

### **103 Rejections**

The Examiner rejected a number of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Johnson in view of various references. Applicant has cancelled these claims. As such, these rejections are believed moot.

**CONCLUSION:**

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5957-72402/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 29, 2007

By: / Dean M. Munyon /  
Dean M. Munyon  
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.  
P. O. Box 398  
Austin, Texas 78767  
(512) 853-8847